

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed on May 12, 2011. Claim 29 has been amended. After entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 29-31 will be pending.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claim was directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, claim 29 is directed to computer-readable media including computer program code and the specification does not explicitly exclude carrier waves, which are non-statutory subject matter. Claim 29 has been amended to include the phrase "non-transitory." Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 29 is directed to all computer-readable media, except a transitory, propagating signal. Thus, Applicants submit that amended claim 29 is directed to patentable subject matter.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office action rejected several claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). To reach a proper determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical "person of ordinary skill in the art" when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. In view of all factual information, the examiner must then make a determination whether the claimed invention "as a whole" would have been obvious at that time to that person. Knowledge of applicant's disclosure must be put aside in reaching this determination, yet kept in mind in order to determine the "differences," conduct the search, and evaluate the "subject matter as a whole" of the invention.¹ A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention.² For at least the following reasons, Applicant submits that the combination of Starkovich and Helgeson does not render any of the claims obvious.

A. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 29-31

Specifically, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starkovich et al U.S. 6,993,585 ("Starkovich") in view of Helgeson et al U.S.

¹ See MPEP 2142.

² *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983); MPEP § 2143.03

7,545,124 ("Helgeson"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that for at least the following reasons claims 1-3, 5-7 and 29-31 are patentable over the combination of Starkovich and Helgeson.

a. Starkovich And Helgeson Do Not Disclose, Teach, Or Suggest Generating, Utilizing Said Hardware Application Server, A Customized Connector Interface On Said Hardware Application Server, By Modifying Said Generic Connector Interface

Independent claim 1 recites in part, "generating, utilizing said hardware application server, a customized connector interface on said hardware application server by modifying said generic connector interface based on said information received by...wherein said customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system." Independent claim 29 recites similar limitations. For at least the following reasons, Applicants submit that Starkovich does not disclose the above features.

Starkovich generally relates to a process for "facilitating on-line processing requests, and more specifically, to adapting client formats to the use of a single gateway in communicating with an On-Line Transaction Processing (OLTP) Enterprise Server from user work stations."³ More specifically, Starkovich discloses WebTx, a *generic gateway* that permits a user of a work station to communicate with other internet applications.⁴ In WebTx, a client sends a service request to an associated adapter, the adapter subsequently converts the input from the client to a standardized format for the generic gateway,⁵ and the converted and processed service requests are transferred from the generic gateway to an appropriate connector of a plurality of connectors.⁶

However, Starkovich does not teach or suggest "generating... a customized connector... interface by modifying [a] generic connector interface," as recited in independent claim 1(emphasis added).⁷ Rather, Starkovich merely translates information received, i.e. information related to a given enterprise system, into a standardized format that is compatible with a generic gateway. Importantly, the generic gateway keeps its generic characteristics.

For clarification and not limitation, as described in the present application, a customized connector interface is generated by modifying a set of properties of the existing generic interface. The modifications fit the requirements necessary to access and communicate with a particular, already existing, interface used to access a particular information system.⁸ Hence,

³ See Starkovich, column 1, lines 33-38.

⁴ See Starkovich, column 3, lines 43-52.

⁵ See Starkovich, column 6 lines 63-67 and column 7 lines 10.

⁶ See Starkovich, column 3, lines 43-52, column 6 lines 63-67 and column 7 lines 10

⁷ See Independent claim 1

⁸ See Specification, page 8.

the newly created customized connector interface is customized based on the properties of the particular information system interface.

In the Office action, the Examiner cited column 8, lines 38-47 of the Starkovich reference, asserting that the clients of a WebTx can access enterprise applications using processing information made of a custom gateway.⁹ However, Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in the cited text refers to a custom gateway interface generated by modifying a set of properties of an existing generic interface (emphasis added). Rather, the cited text refers to the capabilities of the Unisys ClearPath *server*, specifically referring to how the ClearPath server can access enterprise applications. A server is not a gateway. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office action is improperly attributing functionality of a server to a gateway. Moreover, while Starkovich may disclose that a custom gateway may be built by a developer to interface their own applications to an OLTP enterprise application, simply building a custom gateway is not the same as "generating,...a customized connector interface on said hardware application server by modifying said generic connector interface..." as recited in independent claim 1.

Helgeson does not remedy the deficiencies of Starkovich, as Helgeson only generally relates to integrating disparate business applications into a single platform, and managing the applications processes. Nowhere does Helgeson disclose, teach, or suggest "generating, utilizing said hardware application server, a customized connector interface on said hardware application server by modifying said generic connector interface based on said information received by...wherein said customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system," as recited in independent claim 1.

b. Starkovich And Helgeson Do Not Disclose, Teach, Or Suggest Adding A First Interface To The Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) File

Independent claim 1 recites in part, "adding [a] first interface to the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file." Independent claim 29 recites similar limitations. For at least the following reasons, Applicants submit that Starkovich and Helgeson do not disclose the above features.

In the office action the Examiner indicates that Starkovich does not disclose "adding [a] generic interface to [a] Generic Resource Adapter Archive (GRAR) file." The Examiner thus relies on Helgeson to remedy the deficiencies of Starkovich. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that Helgeson does not remedy the deficiencies of Starkovich.

⁹ See Office action, page 4.

Helgeson relates to integrating disparate business applications into a single platform, and managing the applications processes. In particular, Helgeson describes a process for developing a webpage by separating data production, interaction elements, and display information by separating different aspects of page production into different files.¹⁰ However, nowhere does Helgeson disclose, teach, or suggest "adding a first interface to a Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file," as claimed.

Without agreeing with the Examiner's assertions, in the Office action the Examiner compares the GRAR file to an HTML mockup that describes three specifications.¹¹ In particular, the Examiner equates a generic data mode – one of the three specifications of the HTML mockup – as the GRAR file. The Examiner then states, "Helgeson discloses a method adding said first interface to the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file," citing Helgeson, column 58 lines 4-14, and asserting that a new interaction component is added.

Applicants have reviewed the cited portions of Helgeson and respectfully submit that nowhere is a first interface added to a Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file, as claimed in independent claim 1. Rather, the cited text describes procedures for adding interaction components to a model page. The model page is a representation of the parameters received from a browser and the data required to display a web page.¹² Stated differently, the model page invokes all needed commands to perform the tasks of the page and produce the data needed for display.¹³ Thus, the model page is an executable that produces the data needed for displaying, defines widgets, etc., but not a GRAR file.¹⁴ Further, the model page is not the HTML mockup comprising three specifications, which the Examiner equates to a GRAR file.

Thus, for at least the reasons described above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Starkovich and Helgeson does not render independent claim 1 obvious. Independent claim 29 recites similar limitations as independent claim 1; therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is patentable for the same reasons as independent claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 5-7, and 30-31 depend from independent claims 1 and 29 respectively. Applicants submit that a dependent claim incorporates each of the claim elements of the independent claim from which it properly depends. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that

¹⁰ See Helgeson, column 54, lines 57-60.

¹¹ See Office action, page 4.

¹² See Column 55, lines 61-67 and column 56, lines 3-10.

¹³ See Column 55, lines 61-67 and column 56, lines 3-10.

¹⁴ See Column 58, lines 17-28.

claims 2-3, 5-7, and 30-31 are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

B. Claims 9 and 10

Additionally, claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starkovich in view of Helgeson and further in view of Ng, United States Patent No. 6,411,956 ("Ng"). Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that for at least the following reasons claims 9 and 10 are patentable over the combination of Starkovich, Helgeson, and Ng.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above regarding claim 1, Starkovich and Helgeson do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Ng does not cure the defects of Starkovich and Helgeson as Ng only generally relates to a method for distributed transaction support using JDBC drivers, not generating a customized connector interface by modifying a generic connector interface. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Starkovich, Helgeson, and Ng does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 9 and 10 as a whole. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 10 are patentable over Starkovich, Helgeson, and Ng.

III. Conclusion

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the application. Additionally, Applicant submits the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

The Applicants believe no further fees or petitions are required. However, if any such petitions or fees are necessary, please consider this a request therefore and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 501662 accordingly. If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Polsinelli Shughart PC

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Aug. 12, 2011


Derek Donahoe, Reg. No. 59507
Polsinelli Shughart, P.C.
1515 Wynkoop, Suite 600
Denver, CO 80202
(720) 931-8133
(720) 228-2310 Direct Fax